arXiv:1703.07263v1 [math.NT] 21 Mar 2017

MULTIPLE RECIPROCAL SUMS AND MULTIPLE RECIPROCAL STAR SUMS OF POLYNOMIALS ARE ALMOST NEVER INTEGERS

SHAOFANG HONG*, LIPING YANG, QIUYU YIN, AND MIN QIU

Abstract. Let n and k be integers such that $1 \le k \le n$ and $f(x)$ be a nonzero polynomial of nonnegative integer coefficients. For any n-tuple $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ of positive integers, we define

$$H_{k,f}(s,n) := \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)^{s_j}}$$

and

$$H^*_{k,f}(s,n) := \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)^{s_j}}.$$

If all s_j are 1, then let $H_{k,f}(s,n) := H_{k,f}(n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n) := H^*_{k,f}(n)$. Hong and Wang refined the results of Erdös and Niven, and of Chen and Tang by showing that $H_{k,f}(n)$ is not an integer if $n \ge 4$ and $f(x) = ax + b$ with a and b being positive integers. Meanwhile, Luo, Hong, Qian and Wang proved that the similar result holds if $f(x)$ is of nonnegative integer coefficients and of degree no less than two. KH. Hessami Pilehrood, T. Hessami Pilehrood and Tauraso showed that if $f(x) = x$, then $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ are nearly never integers. In this paper, we show that if either $\deg f(x) \ge 2$ or $f(x)$ is linear and $s_j \ge 2$ for all integers j with $1 \le j \le n$, then $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ are not integers except for the case $f(x) = x^m$ with $m \ge 1$ being an integer and $n = k = 1$, in which case, both of $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ are integers.

1. Introduction

Let n and k be integers with $1 \le k \le n$ and $f(x)$ be a polynomial of integer coefficients such that $f(m) \ne 0$ for any positive integer m. For any n-tuple $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ of positive integers, one defines the *multiple reciprocal sum*, denoted by $H_{k,f}(s,n)$, and the *multiple reciprocal star sum*, denoted by $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$, of $f(x)$ as follows:

$$H_{k,f}(s,n) := \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)^{s_j}}$$

and

$$H^*_{k,f}(s,n) := \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)^{s_j}}.$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11M32, 11N05, 11Y70, 11B75.

Key words and phrases. integrality, Multiple reciprocal sum, Multiple reciprocal star sum, value of Riemann zeta function, Bertrand's postulate.

*S.F. Hong is the corresponding author and was supported partially by National Science Foundation of China Grant #11371260.

For brevity, if $s = (1, ..., 1)$, then we write $H_{k,f}(s, n) := H_{k,f}(n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n) := H^*_{k,f}(n)$ that are called the *multiple harmonic sum* and *multiple harmonic star sum* of $f(x)$, respectively. Namely, one has

$$H_{k,f}(n) := \sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)}$$

and

$$H^*_{k,f}(n) := \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)}.$$

It is well known in number theory that if $n \ge 2$ and $f(x) = x$, then $H_{1,f}(n)$ is not an integer. If $n \ge 2$ and $f(x) = ax + b$, where a and b are positive integers, then Erdös and Niven [2] showed in 1946 that there are a finite number of integers n such that $H_{k,f}(n)$ can be an integer. Chen and Tang [1] proved that $H_{k,f}(n)$ cannot be an integer except for either $n = k = 1$ or $n = 3$ and $k = 2$ if $f(x) = x$. Wang and Hong [7] proved that $H_{k,f}(n)$ cannot be an integer if $f(x) = 2x - 1$ and $n \ge 2$. Consequently, Hong and Wang [4] showed that $H_{k,f}(n)$ is not an integer if $n \ge 4$ and $f(x) = ax + b$ with a and b being positive integers. Later on, Luo, Hong, Qian and Wang [6] proved that the similar result holds if $f(x)$ is of nonnegative integer coefficients and of degree no less than two.

Recently, KH. Hessami Pilehrood, T. Hessami Pilehrood and R. Tauraso [3] showed that if $f(x) = x$, then $H_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ are nearly never integers for any n-tuple $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ of positive integers. Naturally, the following interesting question arises: If $f(x)$ is a polynomial of nonnegative integer coefficients, do the similar results hold for $H_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$?

In this paper, we concentrate on the integrality of $H_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$. In fact, we will show that if $f(x)$ and $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ satisfy that either $f(x)$ is of degree at least two or $f(x)$ is linear and $s_j \ge 2$ for all integers j with $1 \le j \le n$, then $H_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ are not integers with the exception that $f(x) = x^m$ with $m \ge 1$ being an integer and $n = 1$. In other words, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $f(x)$ be a nonzero polynomial of nonnegative integer coefficients and $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ be an n-tuple of positive integers such that either $f(x)$ is of degree at least two or $f(x)$ is linear and s_j is greater than two for all integers j with $1 \le j \le n$. Let $n \ge 1$ and k be integers such that $1 \le k \le n$. Then $H_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ are not integers except for the case that $f(x) = x^m$ with $m \ge 1$ being an integer and $n = k = 1$, in which case, both of $H_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ are integers.*

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 2, we show three preliminary lemmas which are needed for the proof of Theorem 1.1. Then, in Section 3, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. The final section is devoted to some remarks. Actually, a conjecture is suggested there.

2. Preliminary lemmas

In this section, we present three lemmas that are needed in the proof of Theorem 1.1. We begin with the following result.

Lemma 2.1. *Let n be a positive integer with $n \ge 2$ and let $f(x)$ be a polynomial of integer coefficients such that $f(m) > 0$ for all positive integers m. Then each of the following is true:*

(i). *For any integer k with $1 \le k \le n-1$, we have $H^*_{k+1,f}(n) < H^*_{1,f}(n)H^*_{k,f}(n)$.*
(ii). *If $H^*_{1,f}(n) < 1$, then $0 < H^*_{k,f}(n) < 1$ for all integers k with $1 \le k \le n$.*

Proof. (i). Let k be an integer such that $1 \le k \le n-1$. Since

$$H^*_{k+1,f}(n) = \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le i_{k+1}\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{f(i_j)}$$

and the coefficients of f are integers such that $f(m) > 0$ for all positive integers m, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} H^*_{k+1,f}(n) &= \sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)} \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le t} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)} \\ &< \sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)} \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)} (\text{since } n \ge 2) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)} \cdot H^*_{k,f}(n) \\ &= H^*_{k,f}(n)\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)}\Big) \\ &= H^*_{1,f}(n)H^*_{k,f}(n) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

as required. So part (i) is proved.

(ii). Clearly, $H^*_{k,f}(n) > 0$ for all integers k with $1 \le k \le n$. Since $H^*_{1,f}(n) < 1$, one has $H^*_{k-1,f}(n)H^*_{1,f}(n) < H^*_{k-1,f}(n)$. But (2.1) gives that $H^*_{k,f}(n) < H^*_{1,f}(n)H^*_{k-1,f}(n)$. So $H^*_{k,f}(n) < H^*_{k-1,f}(n)$. Namely, $H^*_{k,f}(n)$ is decreasing as k increases. Thus $H^*_{k,f}(n) \le H^*_{1,f}(n) < 1$ for all integers k with $1 \le k \le n$. Part (ii) is proved.

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let n and t be positive integers with $n \ge 3$ and let $f(x)$ be a polynomial of integer coefficients such that $f(2)^2 > f(1)f(3)$ and $f(m) > 0$ for all positive integers m. Then for any positive integer k with $k \le n-1$, we have*

$$H^*_{k+1,f}(n) < \Big(\frac{1}{f(1)} + \sum_{t=3}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)}\Big)H^*_{k,f}(n).$$

Proof. Since $f(x)$ is of integer coefficients and $f(m) > 0$ for all positive integers m, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} H^*_{k+1,f}(n) &= \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le i_{k+1}\le n} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{f(i_j)} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)} \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le t} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)} \\ &= \sum_{t=3}^{n} \frac{1}{f(t)} \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le t} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)} + \frac{1}{f(2)} \sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k=2} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{f(1)}\sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k=1}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{1}{f(i_j)}\\
&=\sum_{t=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(t)}H^*_{k,t}(f)+\sum_{i=0}^{k}\frac{1}{f(1)^i f(2)^{k+1-i}}+\frac{1}{f(1)^{k+1}}\\
&\le\sum_{t=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(t)}H^*_{k,n}(f)+\sum_{i=0}^{k}\frac{1}{f(1)^i f(2)^{k+1-i}}+\frac{1}{f(1)^{k+1}}\ (\text{since } t\le n)\\
&=\sum_{t=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(t)}H^*_{k,n}(f)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{f(1)^i f(2)^{k+1-i}}+\frac{1}{f(1)^{k+1}}+\frac{1}{f(2)^{k+1}}. \qquad (2.2)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that the hypothesis that $f(2)^2 > f(1)f(3) > 0$ implies that

$$\frac{1}{f(1)f(3)} > \frac{1}{f(2)^2}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{f(2)^{k+1}} < \frac{1}{f(1)f(3)f(2)^{k-1}}. \qquad (2.3)$$

Then from (2.2) and (2.3) we derive that

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^*_{k+1,f}(n) &< \sum_{t=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(t)}H^*_{k,n}(f)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{f(1)^i f(2)^{k+1-i}}+\frac{1}{f(1)^{k+1}}+\frac{1}{f(1)f(3)f(2)^{k-1}}\\
&< \sum_{t=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(t)}H^*_{k,n}(f)+\frac{1}{f(1)}\sum_{1\le i_1\le\cdots\le i_k\le n}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{1}{f(i_j)}\\
&= \Big(\frac{1}{f(1)}+\sum_{t=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(t)}\Big)H^*_{k,n}(f)
\end{aligned}
$$

as desired. This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.2. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let a, b, m and n be positive integers such that $m < n$. Then*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m\le i<j\le n}\frac{1}{i^a j^b} <& \frac{1}{2}\big(\zeta(a)\zeta(b)-\zeta(a+b)-\zeta(a)H_{m-1}(b)-\zeta(b)H_{m-1}(a)\\
&+H_{m-1}(a)H_{m-1}(b)+H_{m-1}(a+b)\big)
\end{aligned}
$$

with $H_s(t)$ being defined by

$$H_s(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{1}{i^t}$$

for all positive integers s and t.

Proof. By the definitions of $H_s(t)$ and Riemann zeta function, we can easily derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m\le i<j\le n}\frac{1}{i^a j^b} =& \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m\le i\ne j\le n}\frac{1}{i^a j^b}\\
<& \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{i,j\ge m\\ i\ne j}}\frac{1}{i^a j^b}\\
=& \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_{i,j\ge m}\frac{1}{i^a j^b}-\sum_{i=m}^{\infty}\frac{1}{i^{a+b}}\Big)\\
=& \frac{1}{2}\Big(\Big(\sum_{i=m}^{\infty}\frac{1}{i^a}\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=m}^{\infty}\frac{1}{j^b}\Big)-\sum_{i=m}^{\infty}\frac{1}{i^{a+b}}\Big)\\
=& \frac{1}{2}\big(\big(\zeta(a)-H_{m-1}(a)\big)\big(\zeta(b)-H_{m-1}(b)\big)-\big(\zeta(a+b)-H_{m-1}(a+b)\big)\big)\\
=& \frac{1}{2}\big(\zeta(a)\zeta(b)-\zeta(a+b)-\zeta(a)H_{m-1}(b)-\zeta(b)H_{m-1}(a)\\
&+H_{m-1}(a)H_{m-1}(b)+H_{m-1}(a+b)\big)
\end{aligned}$$

as required. The proof of Lemma 2.3 is complete. □

Remark. We notice that the special case that $m=1$ and $a=b=2$ of Lemma 2.3 was used in (2.2) of [6]. We also point out that the special case that $m=3$ and $a=b=2$ of Lemma 2.3 will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 below.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

It is well known that the values of Riemann zeta function at 2 and 4 are given as follows (see, for instance, [5]):

$$\zeta(2)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{j^2}=\frac{\pi^2}{6}\text{ and }\zeta(4)=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{j^4}=\frac{\pi^4}{90}.$$

Then $1<\zeta(2)<2$ and

$$\frac{1}{2}<\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{j^2+2}<\zeta(2)-\frac{3}{4}<1. \tag{3.1}$$

We can now give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. First of all, we treat with $H_{k,f}(s,n)$. Since $f(x)$ is a polynomial of nonnegative integer coefficients and either $\deg f(x)\ge 2$ or $f(x)$ is linear and $s_j\ge 2$ for all integers j with $1\le j\le n$, it follows that for any positive integer r, we have $f(r)^{s_j}\ge r^2$. Then one deduces that if $k\ge 2$, then

$$H_{k,f}(s,n)=\sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_k\le n}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{1}{f(i_j)^{s_j}}\le\sum_{1\le i_1<\cdots<i_k\le n}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{1}{i_j^2}=H_{k,h}(n), \tag{3.2}$$

with $h(x):=x^2$. But it was proved in [6] that $0<H_{k,q}(n)<1$ for any polynomial $q(x)$ of nonnegative integer coefficients and of degree at least two. Hence $0<H_{k,h}(n)<1$. It follows from (3.2) that $0<H_{k,f}(s,n)<1$. In other words, $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ is not an integer if $k\ge 2$. On the other hand, it is clear that $H_{1,f}(s,n)=H^*_{1,f}(s,n)$. So it remains to deal with the integrality of $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ that will be done in what follows.

Let $n = 1$. If $f(x) = x^m$ with $m \geq 1$ being an integer, then $H^*_{1,f}(s,1) = 1$ is an integer. Otherwise, one has $H^*_{1,f}(s,1) = \frac{1}{f(1)^{s_1}} < 1$ that infers that $H^*_{1,f}(s,1)$ is not an integer. In the remaining of the proof, we always let $n > 1$. We divide the proof into the following four cases.

Case 1. $f(x)$ is a monomial. One may write $f(x) = a_m x^m$ with $m \geq 1$ and $a_m \geq 1$. Then by Bertrand's postulate, there is at least one prime p such that $\frac{n}{2} < p \leq n$, i.e. $p \leq n < 2p$. So p cannot divide any integer between 1 and n different from p. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} a_m^{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i} \cdot H^*_{k,f}(s,n) &= \sum_{1\leq i_1\leq\cdots\leq i_k\leq n, \exists i_j\neq p} \frac{1}{(i_1)^{s_1 m}\cdots(i_k)^{s_k m}} + \sum_{i_1=\cdots=i_k=p} \frac{1}{(i_1)^{s_1 m}\cdots(i_k)^{s_k m}} \\ &:= \frac{a}{bp^e} + \frac{1}{p^{m\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i}}, \end{aligned}$$

with a, b and e being positive integers such that $(a,b) = (a,p) = (b,p) = 1$ and $0 \leq e < m\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i$. Then one can deduce that

$$a_m^{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i} \cdot bp^{m\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i} \cdot H^*_{k,f}(s,n) = ap^{m(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i)-e} + b. \tag{3.3}$$

Suppose that $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ is an integer. Then p divides both of

$$bp^{m\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i} \cdot H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$$

and

$$ap^{m\left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{k} s_i\right)-e}.$$

Then from (3.3) one can read that p divides b, which contradicts to the fact that $p \nmid b$. So $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ must be non-integer. Theorem 1.1 is proved in this case.

Case 2. $f(x)$ holds degree at least two and contains at least two terms and $f(x) \neq x^2 + 1$. Claim that $H^*_{1,f}(n) < 1$. Then by Lemma 2.1, one knows that $0 < H^*_{k,f}(n) < 1$ for all integers k with $1 \leq k \leq n$. Since the coefficients of $f(x)$ are nonnegative integers, for any positive integer r and t, we have $f(r) \geq 1$, so $f(r)^t \geq f(r)$. Hence we can deduce that

$$0 < H^*_{k,f}(s,n) \leq H^*_{k,f}(n) < 1.$$

In other words, $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ is not an integer for all integers k with $1 \leq k \leq n$. It remains to show the truth of the claim that will be done in what follows.

One lets $f(x) = a_m x^m + a_{m-1}x^{m-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$ with $m \geq 2$ being an integer, $a_m \geq 1$, $\max(a_0, \cdots, a_{m-1}) \geq 1$ and $f(x) \neq x^2 + 1$. Consider the following subcases.

Case 2.1. $m = 2$, $a_1 = 0$, $a_0 \geq 1$ and $\max(a_2, a_0) \geq 2$. Then for any positive integer j, one can derive that $f(j) \geq a_2 j^2 + a_0 \geq j^2 + 2$. It follows from (3.1) that

$$H^*_{1,f}(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(j)} < \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{f(j)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j^2+2} < 1.$$

Hence the claim is true in this case.

CASE 2.2. $m = 2$ and $a_1 \geq 1$. Since $a_2 \geq 1$ and $a_1 \geq 1$, we deduce that $f(j) \geq j^2 + j$ for any positive integer j. So

$$H^*_{1,f}(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(j)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{j(j+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Big(\frac{1}{j} - \frac{1}{j+1}\Big) = 1 - \frac{1}{n+1} < 1 \tag{3.4}$$

as claimed. The claim holds in this case.

CASE 2.3. $m \geq 3$. Since $\max(a_0, \cdots, a_{m-1}) \geq 1$, we derive that $f(j) \geq j^3 + 1 \geq j^2 + j$ for any positive integer j. Thus (3.4) keeps valid. So the claim is proved in this case.

CASE 3. $f(x) = x^2 + 1$. Notice that s_1 is the first component of s. We divide the proof into the following subcases.

CASE 3.1. $k = 1$ and $s_1 = 1$. Then we have

$$H^*_{1,f}(s, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i^2 + 1}$$

increases as n increases. By some computations, we find that $H^*_{1,f}(s, 12) < 1$ and $H^*_{1,f}(s, 13) > 1$. So if $n \geq 13$, then

$$1 < H^*_{1,f}(s, 13) \leq H^*_{1,f}(s, n) < \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i^2} < \zeta(2) < 2.$$

On the other hand, if $2 \leq n \leq 12$, then we have

$$\frac{1}{2} < H^*_{1,f}(s, n) \leq H^*_{1,f}(s, 12) < 1.$$

So we can conclude that $H^*_{1,f}(s, n)$ is not an integer in this case.

CASE 3.2. $k = 1$ and $s_1 > 1$. Clearly, one has

$$0 < H^*_{1,f}(s, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{f(i)^{s_1}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(i^2+1)^2} < \frac{1}{4} + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \frac{1}{i^4} < \zeta(4) - \frac{3}{4} < 1.$$

In other words, $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ is not an integer if $k = 1$ and $s_1 > 1$.

CASE 3.3. $k > 1$. Since $f(r)^t \geq f(r) > 0$ for any positive integers r and t, we can deduce that $0 < H^*_{k,f}(s, n) \leq H^*_{k,f}(n)$. We claim that $H^*_{k,f}(n) < 1$ if $k > 1$. Then it follows that $0 < H^*_{k,f}(s, n) < 1$ which means that $H^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ is not an integer if $k > 1$. In the following, we show the truth of the claim. Its proof is divided into two subcases.

CASE 3.3.1. $k = 2$. Then $n \geq 2$. If $n = 2$, then we can easily compute that $H^*_{2,f}(2) = \frac{39}{100} < 1$ as claimed. Now let $n \geq 3$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 < H^*_{2,f}(n) =& \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \frac{1}{(i^2+1)(j^2+1)} \\
=& \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(i^2+1)^2} + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{1}{(i^2+1)(j^2+1)} \\
=& \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{25} + \sum_{i=3}^{n} \frac{1}{i^4 + 2i^2 + 1} + \sum_{j=2}^{n} \frac{1}{2(j^2+1)} \\
&+ \sum_{j=3}^{n} \frac{1}{5(j^2+1)} + \sum_{3 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{1}{(i^2+1)(j^2+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=3}^{n}\frac{1}{i^4+2i^2+1}<\sum_{i=3}^{\infty}\frac{1}{i^4}=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{i^4}-1-\frac{1}{16}=\zeta(4)-\frac{17}{16}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\sum_{j=2}^{n}\frac{1}{2(j^2+1)}<\sum_{j=2}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2j^2}=\frac{1}{2}\big(\zeta(2)-1\big), \tag{3.6}$$

$$\sum_{j=3}^{n}\frac{1}{5(j^2+1)}<\sum_{j=3}^{\infty}\frac{1}{5j^2}=\frac{1}{5}\Big(\zeta(2)-\frac{5}{4}\Big) \tag{3.7}$$

and Lemma 2.3 tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{3\le i<j\le n}\frac{1}{(i^2+1)(j^2+1)}<&\sum_{3\le i<j\le n}\frac{1}{i^2j^2}\\ <&\frac{1}{2}\Big(\zeta(2)^2-\frac{5}{2}\zeta(2)-\zeta(4)+\frac{25}{16}+\frac{17}{16}\Big)\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big(\zeta(2)^2-\frac{5}{2}\zeta(2)-\zeta(4)+\frac{21}{8}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

by (3.9),(3.6),(3.7) and (3.8), one can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}H^*_{2,f}(n)<&\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{25}+\Big(\zeta(4)-\frac{17}{16}\Big)+\frac{1}{2}\big(\zeta(2)-1\big)+\frac{1}{5}\Big(\zeta(2)-\frac{5}{4}\Big)\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\Big(\zeta(2)^2-\frac{5}{2}\zeta(2)-\zeta(4)+\frac{21}{8}\Big)\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\zeta(4)+\frac{1}{2}\zeta(2)^2-\frac{11}{20}\zeta(2)-\frac{21}{100}\\ =&\frac{7}{360}\pi^4-\frac{11}{120}\pi^2-\frac{21}{100}<1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus one can conclude that $H^*_{2,f}(n)<1$ is not an integer if $n\ge 2$. The claim is proved in this case.

Case 3.3.2. $k\ge 3$. Since $f(x)=x^2+1$, it follows that if $n=3$, then

$$0<\frac{1}{f(1)}+\sum_{i=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(i)}=\frac{1}{1^2+1}+\frac{1}{3^2+1}=\frac{3}{5}<1,$$

and if $n\ge 4$, then

$$\begin{aligned}0<&\frac{1}{f(1)}+\sum_{i=3}^{n}\frac{1}{f(i)}\\ <&\frac{1}{1^2+1}+\frac{1}{3^2+1}+\sum_{i=4}^{n}\frac{1}{i^2}\\ =&\frac{1}{1^2+1}+\frac{1}{3^2+1}-1-\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{9}+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{i^2}\\ <&\zeta(2)-\frac{137}{180}<1.\end{aligned}$$

But $f(2)^2=25>20=f(1)f(3)$. Thus by Lemma 2.2, we infer that $H^*_{k,f}(n)<H^*_{k-1,f}(n)$, which implies that $H^*_{k,f}(n)$ is decreasing as k increases. Hence $0<H^*_{k,f}(n)<H^*_{2,f}(n)<1$. The claim is true in this case.

Case 4. $f(x) = ax + b$ with $a, b \geq 1$ and $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ is an n-tuple of positive integers such that $s_j \geq 2$ for all integers j with $1 \leq j \leq n$. For any positive integer r, we derive that $f(r)^{s_j} \geq (r+1)^2$. So we have

$$H^*_{k,f}(s,n) = \sum_{1\leq i_1\leq\cdots\leq i_k\leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(i_j)^{s_j}} \leq \sum_{1\leq i_1\leq\cdots\leq i_k\leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{(i_j+1)^2} = H^*_{k,g}(n), \quad (3.9)$$

where $g(x) = x^2 + 2x + 1$.

But we have showed in Case 2 that $0 < H^*_{k,q}(n) < 1$ for all integers k with $1 \leq k \leq n$ if $\deg q(x) \geq 2$ and $q(x)$ contains at least two terms as well as $q(x) \neq x^2 + 1$. Hence $0 < H^*_{k,g}(n) < 1$. Then from (3.9) one derives that $0 < H^*_{k,f}(s,n) < 1$. Thus $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ is not an integer in this case.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

4. Final remarks

Let $n \geq 1$ and k be integers such that $1 \leq k \leq n$. Let $f(x)$ be a nonzero polynomial of integer coefficients and $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ be an n-tuple of positive integers.

For the case that $s_1 = ... = s_n = 1$, we know by [4] that $H_{k,f}(n)$ is not an integer if $f(x) = ax + b$ with a and b being nonnegative integers and $n \geq 4$, and by [6] that $H_{k,f}(n)$ is not an integer if $f(x)$ is of nonnegative integer coefficients with $\deg(f(x)) \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2$. It is proved in [3] that if $f(x) = x$, then $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ are nearly never integers for any n-tuple $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ of positive integers. If either $f(x)$ is of degree at least two or $f(x)$ is linear and s_j is greater than two for all integers j with $1 \leq j \leq n$, then by Theorem 1.1 one knows that $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ are not integers except for the case that $f(x) = x^m$ with $m \geq 1$ being an integer and $n = k = 1$, in which case, both of $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ are integers. However, for the case that $f(x)$ is a linear polynomial of nonnegative integer coefficients different from x, if there exists one j with $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $s_j = 1$, then the integrality for $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ is still unknown. This problem keeps open.

Now let $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^+$ be the set of integers and the set of positive integers, respectively. Let $Z_f := \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : f(x) = 0\}$ and $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} := \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus Z_f$ be arranged in increasing order. Then $f(a_k) \neq 0$ for all integers $k \geq 1$. Define

$$M_{k,f}(s,n) := \sum_{1\leq i_1<\cdots<i_k\leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(a_{i_j})^{s_j}}$$

and

$$M^*_{k,f}(s,n) := \sum_{1\leq i_1\leq\cdots\leq i_k\leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1}{f(a_{i_j})^{s_j}}.$$

If Z_f is empty, then $M_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $M^*_{k,f}(s,n)$ become $H_{k,f}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f}(s,n)$, respectively. On the one hand, for any given integer $N_0 \geq 1$, one can easily find a polynomial $f_0(x)$ of integer coefficients such that for all integers n and k with $1 \leq k \leq n \leq N_0$, both of $H_{k,f_0}(s,n)$ and $H^*_{k,f_0}(s,n)$ are integers. In fact, letting

$$f_0(x) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_0} (x-k) \pm 1$$

gives us the desired result. On the other hand, for any given nonzero polynomial $f(x)$ of integer coefficients, we believe that the similar integrality result is still true. So in

concluding this paper, we propose the following more general conjecture which extends Conjecture 3.1 of [6].

Conjecture 4.1. *Let $f(x)$ be a nonzero polynomial of integer coefficients and $s = (s_1, ..., s_n)$ be an n-tuple of positive integers. Then there is a positive integer N such that for any integer $n \geq N$ and for all integers k with $1 \leq k \leq n$, both of $M_{k,f}(s, n)$ and $M^*_{k,f}(s, n)$ are not integers.*

References

1. Y. Chen and M. Tang, On the elementary symmetric functions of $1, 1/2, ..., 1/n$, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **119** (2012), 862-867.
2. P. Erdös and I. Niven, Some properties of partial sums of the harmonic series, *Bull. Amer. Math Soc.* **52** (1946), 248-251.
3. KH. Hessami Pilehrood, T. Hessami Pilehrood and R. Tauraso, Multiple harmonic sums and multiple harmonic star sums are (nearly) never integers, *Integers* **17** (2017), in press.
4. S. Hong and C. Wang, The elementary symmetric functions of reciprocal arithmetic progressions, *Acta Math. Hungari.* **144** (2014), 196-211.
5. N. Koblitz, *p-Adic numbers, p-adic analysis and zeta-functions*, GTM 58, Spinger-Verlag, New York, 1984.
6. Y. Luo, S. Hong, G. Qian and C. Wang, The elementary symmetric functions of a reciprocal polynomial sequence, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* **352** (2014), 269-272.
7. C. Wang and S. Hong, On the integrality of the elementary symmetric functions of $1, 1/3, ..., 1/(2n-1)$, *Math. Slovaca* **65** (2015), 957-962.

Mathematical College, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P.R. China
E-mail address: sfhong@scu.edu.cn; s-f.hong@tom.com; hongsf02@yahoo.com

Mathematical College, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P.R. China
E-mail address: yanglp2013@126.com

Mathematical College, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P.R. China
E-mail address: yinqiuyu26@126.com

Mathematical College, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P.R. China
E-mail address: qiumin126@126.com